Anomaly in the seniority list of Engineers of CPWD

1023. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the CPWD has recently published a seniority list in 1989. showing the *inter s*e seniority of its engineers at the level of Executive Engineers;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the persons promoted as Executive Engineers in the CPWD in 1979 and onwards and working continuously as such since then do not find a place in the afore-said seniority list whereas persons promoted in 1983 have been included in that list- and

(c) if the answer to (b) above is in the affirmative, the reasons for such anomaly and what steps Government propose to take to correct the same?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) Yes, Sir. The post of Executive Engineer is filled from two channels, viz., (i) by promotion of Assistant Executive Engineers by seniority-com-fitness; and (ii) by promotion of Assistant Engineers on selection basis. The Supreme Court in its Judgement dated 23rd May, 1984 in the case of P. S. Mahal and others Vs. Union of India and Others had ordered that seniority between Assistant Engineers and Assistant Executive Engineers regularly pro-moted within their respective quota must be determined by the length of continuous officiation of service in the grade of Executive Engineer subject to the qualification that in case of Assistant Engineers the length of continuous officiation shall be reckoned from the date when their promotion is regularised by absorption within their lawful quota. The senioritfiy list of Executive Engineers issued in 1989 has been prepared keeping in view the order of the Supreme Court. While preparing the seniority list vacancy in the grade of Executive Engineer up to 1983 was taken into account. Names of those Executive Engineers who were promoted from the grade of Assistant Engineer in excess of their quota and who were absorbed in their quota up to 1983 have been included. Therefore, there is no anomaly which needs to be corrected. As Assistant Engineers are being promoted on *ad-hoc* basis to the grade of Executive Engineer since 1973 due to seniority disputes their names will be included in the seniority list after regular promotion in the grade of Executive Engineer.

Disparity in promotional avenue of cupying relatively lower position

1024. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that upto 1978 examination the engineers in the C. P. W. D. who were recruited on the basis of the Combined Engineering Services Examination conducted by the UPSC and the person occupying a higher place in the examination were taken in as Assistant Executive Engineers in Class I post and those occupying relatively lower position were placed as Assistant Engineers in Class II post;

(b) whether it is also a fact that a person appointed as Assistant Executive Engineer in 1963 examination on the basis of Combined Engineering Service Examination, is already working as Chief Engineer in the C. P. W. D. whereas another person recruited in the same year on the basis of same examination as Assistant Engineers is still working as Executive Engineers; and

(c) if so, the reasons for such a wide disparity in the promotion prospects of the two categories of officer of Assistant Executive Engineers and Assistant Engineer who are similarly placed and what steps Government propose to take to wipe out this disparity?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) Direct recruitment of Assistant Engineers had been suspended from 1. 4. 1972. Prior to this Assistant Executive Engineers and Assistant Engineers had been appointed on the basis of the combined Engineering Services Examination conducted by the Union Public Service Commission.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Reasons for disparity in the Promotion prospects of the two categories are (i) Assistant Executive Engineers are recruited in the grade of Group 'A' service and Assistant Engineers^in the grade of Group 'B (ii) 8he cadre of Assistant Executive Engineers is only on the basis of Combined Engineering Services Examination whereas the cadre of Assistant Engineers consists of officers by direct recruitment and also by promotion of Junior Engineers; (iii) the number of officers in the cadre of AEEs being smaller than those in the cadre of AEs as compared to the quotas which have been in operation from time to time, the officers in the AEE cadre due to their seniority are promoted at a faster rate as compared to those in the AE cadre.

As Group 'A' and Group 'B' services are not similarly placed at the time of recruitment, it would not be pos-sib'e t_0 wipe out the disparity in the promotion prospects.

Harassment of Class IV Employees of Directorate of Delhi Doordarshan

1025. SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM: Will the Mtniste$_r$ $_0$f URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it i$_s$ a fact that the Directorate of Estates served some notices to the Directorate of Delhi Doordarshan, Mandi House, New Delhi in August 1989, December, 1989 and March, 1990 in respect of pay ment of Rs. 2300|- as over stay charges by the class IV em ployees of the said Directorate where as no such allotment was made to any of the employees; if so, the reasons **thereof;**

(b) whether it is a fact that the D. G. Doordarshan has written many a times to the Directorate of Estates on (a) above but no action was taken there on; if so, the reasons therefor; and

Y

(c) whether it is also a fact that the Directorate of Estates again served a notice in the month of October * and November, 1990 without any signature to the Assistant Director, Delhi Doordarshan with a copy to one of its employees if so, the reasons therefor " and what action is being contemplated against the erring officials?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) to (c) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of th$_e$ Sabha. Refusal of Government

Accommodation to Allottee on Account of No-Payment of overstay dues by their Parents

1026. SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether possession of Govern ment accommodation allotted under appropriate rules t_0 the wards of re tired Government employees is refus ed on the ground of non-payment of charges for overstay in the Govern ment accommodation allotted to their parents; and

(b) if so, in how many cases such possession was refused and in how many cases possession was handed over before clearance of overstayal dues by their parents during June, 1989; and the reason for discrimina tion in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) The concession of ad-hoc allotment/regularisation to the ward of a retired Government servant is given subject to the condition that there are ^{no} outstanding dues in the case.

(b) No separate statistics are maintained.